

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**Patent Application**

5 Appellant(s): Lawrence A. Rigge  
Case: Rigge 7  
Serial No.: 10/672,656  
Filing Date: September 26, 2003  
Group: 2617  
10 Examiner: Kiet M. Doan  
  
Title: Method and System for Wireless Communication With an Integrated Circuit  
Under Evaluation

15 \_\_\_\_\_

**REPLY BRIEF**

20 Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

25 Sir:

Appellant hereby replies to the Examiner’s Answer, mailed January 22, 2010 (referred  
to hereinafter as “the Examiner’s Answer”), in an Appeal of the final rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7,  
30 11-14, 16-19 and 23-25 in the above-identified patent application.

**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in Appellant’s Appeal  
Brief.

35

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

A statement identifying related appeals is contained in Appellant’s Appeal Brief.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

A statement identifying the status of the claims is contained in Appellant's Appeal Brief.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

A statement identifying the status of the amendments is contained in Appellant's Appeal Brief.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

A Summary of the Invention is contained in Appellant's Appeal Brief.

STATEMENT OF GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A statement identifying the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is contained in Appellant's Appeal Brief.

CLAIMS APPEALED

A copy of the appealed claims is contained in an Appendix of Appellant's Appeal Brief.

ARGUMENT

Independent Claims

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 were rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. in view of Gass. With regard to claim 1, for example, the Examiner asserts that King et al. teach transmitting a wireless signal from said integrated circuit device to said monitoring station using an antenna associated with said integrated circuit device, wherein said antenna is a pin on said integrated circuit device. (citing col. 1, lines 56-62; col. 3, lines 18-23 and 31-39; col. 5, lines 51-65 and FIG. 1).

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, however, King et al. do not disclose or suggest "wherein said antenna is a pin on said integrated circuit device." Rather, King et al. expressly teach using an antenna that is *external* from the integrated RFID circuit. In col. 1, lines 52-53 and 61-62,

it is expressly stated that at least one pin is an antenna pin for connection to an *external* antenna (conductive belt in tire). In other words, the RFID pin is merely a *connector* to an external antenna. See also, col. 3, line 22.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Final Rejection, the Examiner asserts that King et al. teach, at col. 5, lines 61-62, that “at least one pin is an antenna pin for connection to an external antenna.” A pin that is “an antenna pin *for connection to an external* antenna.” however, does not disclose or suggest that “said *antenna is a pin* on said integrated circuit device.” as required by the independent claims.

In the Examiner’s Answer, the Examiner asserts that King teaches that the antenna can be either external or internal to the RFID chip 10 (col. 3, lines 61-65).

Regarding an external antenna, Appellants reiterate that it is expressly stated in King that at least one pin is an antenna pin for connection to an *external* antenna (conductive belt in tire). In other words, the RFID pin is merely a *connector* to an external antenna. See col. 1, lines 52-53 and 61-62; also, col. 3, line 22. Regarding an internal antenna, Appellants note that “internal” is defined as “situated or existing in the interior of something.” (See, dictionary.com) A pin on an integrated circuit is *not situated or existing in the interior* of the integrated circuit; therefore, the disclosure of an internal antenna does not infer that the antenna is a pin. In any case, King does *not* disclose or suggest that “said *antenna is a pin*.”

The Examiner acknowledges that King et al. do not teach “monitoring station performs one or more of testing, debugging and evaluating said integrated circuit,” but asserts that Gass teaches this feature.

Appellant notes that Gass *teaches away* from wireless communications between an integrated circuit device and a monitoring station that is debugging the integrated circuit. First, Gass does not address any type of communication between an *integrated circuit* device being tested and a monitoring station. Rather, Gass is directed to communications between a host device and a target device. While the host device may be a test/debug device, there is no disclosure that the target device is an integrated circuit. In any event, Gass specifically shows *wired* connections between the between a host device and a target device. See, e.g., FIG. 1.

This “teaching away” argument has not been addressed by the Examiner.

As stated in the Abstract, Gass teaches an enhanced parallel port JTAG interface (IEEE Test Access Port). The enhanced JTAG *cable* is connectable between an Enhanced Parallel Port (EPP) and a JTAG port and has increased performance over using a Standard Parallel Port (SPP). The use of the JTAG *cable* by Gass *teaches away* from *wireless* communications between an integrated circuit device and a monitoring station that is debugging the integrated circuit.

KSR Considerations

As indicated above, there is no teaching of the antenna being a pin on the integrated circuit device. Thus, even as combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, King et al. and Gass *do not teach every element of the independent claims*. Furthermore, based on the KSR considerations discussed hereinafter, the combination/modification suggested by the Examiner is not appropriate. Other than to allege that the improvement of wireless short range operation, the Examiner has failed to establish “an apparent reason to combine ... known elements.” *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR)*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). Appellant queries how an alleged “improvement of wireless short range operation” suggests wireless communications between an integrated circuit device and a monitoring station that is debugging the integrated circuit. The examiner has not identified any portion of King et al. or Gass that actually teaches “improvement of wireless short range operation” or that would otherwise suggest a combination in the manner suggested by the present invention. The Examiner has not met the burden of proof under *KSR*.

There is no suggestion in King et al. or in Gass, alone or in combination, to employ wireless communications between an integrated circuit device and a monitoring station that is debugging the integrated circuit.

As asserted above, Gass’ use of a *hard-wired* cable *teaches away* from the present invention. The *KSR* Court discussed in some detail *United States v. Adams*, 383 U.S. 39 (1966), stating in part that in that case, “[t]he Court relied upon the corollary principle that when the prior art teaches away from combining certain known elements, discovery of a successful means of combining them is more likely to be nonobvious.” (*KSR* Opinion at p. 12). Thus, there is no reason to make the asserted combination/modification.

Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not combine King et al. and Gass in the manner asserted by the Examiner.

Further, Appellant suggests that this *seventh* rejection that fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness is itself evidence of the non-obviousness of the present invention.

Thus, Appellant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of the independent claims.

#### Dependent Claims

Dependent claims 2, 4-12 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of King et al., Gass, Welch and Schmidt. Claims 2, 4-12 and 14-15 are dependent on claims 1 and 13, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over King et al., Gass, Welch and Schmidt, alone or in any combination, because of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 13 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

Dependent Claims 11-12 and 23-24 are being appealed.

In rejecting claims 11 and 23, the Examiner acknowledges in the Office Action that King and Gass do not disclose that the signal is a test command. The Applicant merely cites Schmidt for this purpose, but does not establish any motivation for combining King et al., Gass, and Schmidt. Other than to “enable communications,” the Examiner has failed to establish “an apparent reason to combine ... known elements.” *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR)*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). Appellant submits that wirelessly transmitting a test pattern using an antenna that is a pin on the integrated circuit device is not disclosed or suggested by the combination of King et al., Gass, and Schmidt.

In rejecting claims 12 and 24, the Examiner recites in the Office Action that King teaches that the signal is a memory pattern to be applied to a memory area. Citing Col. 3, lines 55-60. In the text cited by the Examiner, King teaches “memory 18 for storage of information”; King, however, does not disclose or suggest wirelessly transmitting a memory pattern to be applied to a memory area on said integrated circuit device using an antenna that is a pin on the integrated circuit

#### Conclusion

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11-14, 16-19 and 23-25, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner or the Appeal Board has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner and the Appeal Board are invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The attention of the Examiner and the Appeal Board to this matter is appreciated.

5

Respectfully,



Date: February 5, 2010

10

Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Appellant(s)  
Reg. No. 36,597  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560

15

APPENDIX

1. A method for wireless communication between an integrated circuit device and a monitoring station, said method comprising the steps of:
- 5 transmitting a wireless signal from said integrated circuit device to said monitoring station using an antenna associated with said integrated circuit device, wherein said antenna is a pin on said integrated circuit device, and wherein said monitoring station performs one or more of testing, debugging and evaluating said integrated circuit.
- 10 2. The method of claim 1, wherein said antenna is incorporated in said integrated circuit device.
3. (Cancelled)
- 15 4. The method of claim 2, wherein at antenna is printed on said integrated circuit device.
5. The method of claim 1, wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with an 802.11 wireless standard.
- 20 6. The method of claim 1, wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with an ultra wide band wireless standard.
7. The method of claim 1, wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with a Bluetooth standard.
- 25 8. (Cancelled).
9. (Cancelled).
- 30 10. (Cancelled).

11. The method of claim 1, wherein said signal is a test command.

12. The method of claim 1, wherein said signal is a memory pattern to be applied to a memory area on said integrated circuit device.

5

13. An integrated circuit device, comprising:  
at least one circuit; and  
an antenna for wireless communication with an external monitoring station, wherein said antenna is a pin on said integrated circuit device, and wherein said monitoring station performs one or more of testing, debugging and evaluating said integrated circuit.

10

14. The integrated circuit device of claim 13, wherein said antenna is incorporated in said integrated circuit device.

15 15. (Cancelled).

16. The integrated circuit device of claim 14, wherein at antenna is printed on said integrated circuit device.

20 17. The integrated circuit device of claim 13, wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with an 802.11 wireless standard.

18. The integrated circuit device of claim 13, wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with an ultra wide band wireless standard.

25

19. The integrated circuit device of claim 13, wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with a Bluetooth standard.

20. (Cancelled).

30



21. (Cancelled).

22. (Cancelled).

5 23. The integrated circuit device of claim 13, wherein said signal is a test command.

24. The integrated circuit device of claim 13, wherein said signal is a memory pattern to be applied to a memory area on said integrated circuit device.

10 25. A method for wireless communication between an integrated circuit device and a monitoring station, said method comprising the steps of:

transmitting a wireless signal to said monitoring station from said integrated circuit device using an antenna associated with said integrated circuit device, wherein said antenna is a pin on said integrated circuit device, and wherein said monitoring station performs one or more of  
15 testing, debugging and evaluating said integrated circuit.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no evidence submitted pursuant to § 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by the Examiner and relied upon by appellant.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no known decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of 37 CFR 41.37.